



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The animus of these articles is unfortunate. The writer is looking for superstitions, and seems pleased to find more of them in the Bible than in paganism; more in the New Testament than in the Old; more in Jesus than in Philo. This animus not only annoys the reader, but harms the writer's critical faculty. In large measure he combats views we do not hold, and does not touch the questions we think, historically, most important. One would expect from so good a scholar a better example of historical discussion "from a newer and more critical standpoint."

FRANK C. PORTER.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

PROLEGOMENA ZUM LUCAS-EVANGELIUM. VON ADOLF HILGENFELD;  
*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1897, pp. 411-32.

AFTER sketching the German investigation of the origin of the third gospel from Fr. Schleiermacher to H. Ewald, the writer states his view as a modification of Baur's. He holds the order Matthew, Mark, Luke. Matthew is the eastern form of the primitive gospel for the Gentile church, and has a decided anti-Pauline tendency. Mark is the western version of the primitive gospel, from which the anti-Pauline character of Matthew is removed. This prepared the way for the third gospel. The author of this skillfully turns against the Jews what Matthew aims at Paul. Where he adds to Matthew and Mark he had in part written sources, notably in the passage 9:51-18:14.

Hilgenfeld says that he has tried to steer between the Scylla of a pure tendency writing and the Charybdis of a mere copyist activity. Luke gathers out of the older writings, chiefly out of the first two canonical gospels, but he is also the first who gave to the material of the evangelical history the spirit of a moderate Paulinism.

Weisse's theory of two sources, weakened by Simons and Holtzmann, is not commended by the attempt of Feine, who represents Luke as having each of the original documents before him in two varying editions.

Hahn's denial that Luke counted Matthew and Mark among the "many" who had written is discussed at length, following the text of Luke 1:1-4. The "many" belong to the side of the primitive apostles (as against Paul). Their writings were not in every respect satisfactory, and the author ad Theophilum resolved to compose a gospel. He does not claim to be an eyewitness or to have received aught from eyewitnesses. He traced the course of all things in the writings of the "many," and does not claim to draw from oral tradition. He writes primarily for his friend and patron Theophilus.

We may regard this dedication as something new, and as a proof that some of the many gospels had already been widely adopted for the use of the church.

A Pauline tone is heard also in the statement of the purpose of the third gospel—"that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the words (teachings) in which thou wast instructed." This implies that the author was not satisfied with the *teaching* of the extant gospels. He does not refer to their chronicle of events out of the life of Jesus.

This Pauline gospel has preserved much out of the early tradition which is of historical value.

In the *Altchristliche Prolegomena zu den kanonischen Evangelien* Hilgenfeld gives the *argumenta* prefixed to the gospels in the oldest editions of the Vulgate. He infers that Christian antiquity emphasized the close relation of the canonical gospels to the persons (or tendencies) of the evangelists.

Of these two articles by Hilgenfeld the second has very slight value, for the *argumenta* of the Vulgate contribute nothing to our knowledge of the origin of Luke's gospel.

The bulk of the first article is a criticism of Hahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas erklärt*, Bd. I, II, 1892, 1894, and an analysis of Luke 1:1-4. I cannot discover in it a proof that Matthew and Mark were among the "many" who had drawn up narratives regarding the life of Jesus, nor can I see in Luke 1:1-4 any clear indication that the author took the side of Paul as against the primitive apostles.

GEORGE H. GILBERT.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

LE PROLOGUE DU QUATRIÈME ÉVANGILE. Par ALFRED LOISY; *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses*, Tome II (1897), Nos. 1, 2, 3.

I. Vss. 1-5 constitute a general preface to the gospel. They are characterized by a strophic arrangement and musical cadence. (1) *The Logos considered in himself*. Before time or the world was the Word. He exists independently of time.  $\delta \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  is not the "reason" of Philo, but the revelation or expression of God. John derived the word from current philosophy, and applies it as a scientific definition of Christ, which is interpreted in the body of the book. (2) *The Logos in relation to God*. Logos was not manifested in time nor seen. He existed "before" God, "near to him," "one with him;"  $\delta \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  here designates the Father. The absence of the article before  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  in the next phrase gives the noun a qualitative force. "The Word was God," i. e., of divine nature. (3) *The Logos in relation to the*